



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/803,845	03/12/2001	Sam J. DiRaimondo	CM01891G	1286

22917 7590 09/20/2005

MOTOROLA, INC.
1303 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD
IL01/3RD
SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196

EXAMINER

PHAN, RAYMOND NGAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2111

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/803,845

Applicant(s)

DIRAIMONDO ET AL.

Examiner

Raymond Phan

Art Unit

2111

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 12-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 8, 9, 21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7, 10 and 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant(s)

1. This action is responsive to the following communications:
amendment filed on July 5, 2005.
2. This application has been examined. Claims 1-22 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 8-9, 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alanara et al. (EPNo 448369A2) in view of Yacoob (US No 6,170,742).

In regard to claim 1, Alanara et al. disclose a method of regulating usage in a smart card system comprising at a card acceptance location (see col. 1, lines 1-30); detecting the presence of the card (see col. 4, lines 6-41); determining an ID code from the smart card (see col. 4, lines 6-41). But Alanara et al. do not specifically disclose the step of checking the ID code against a list stored locally at the card acceptance location, wherein the list is received from a second device; and if the ID code of the smart card is listed on the list, performing an action on the smart card. However Yacoob discloses step of checking the ID code against a list stored locally at the card acceptance location (see col. 13, lines 20 through col. 14, line 21), wherein the list is received from a second device (see col. 13, line 20 through col. 14, line 21); and if the ID code of the smart card is listed on the list, performing

an action on the smart card (see col. 7, lines 31-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Jacobo within the system of Alanara et al. because it would provide an independent system which fully contains all information that may impact the maintenance and operation of the machine.

In regard to claim 2, Alanara et al. disclose wherein the action is selected from a group of consisting of disabling the smart card, enabling the smart card (see col. 4, lines 6-41).

In regard to claim 3, Jacobo disclose wherein the smart card has status data and wherein the action performed is disabling the smart card that comprising at least changing the status data in the smart card to indicate disabled (see col. 15, lines 21-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Jacobo within the system of Alanara et al. because it would provide an independent system which fully contains all information that may impact the maintenance and operation of the machine.

In regard to claim 4, Jacobo disclose wherein the smart card has status data and wherein the action performed is enabling the smart card that comprising at least changing the status data in the smart card to indicate enabled (see col. 15, lines 32-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Jacobo within the system of Alanara et al. because it would provide an independent system which fully contains all information that may impact the maintenance and operation of the machine.

In regard to claim 8, Yacoob discloses modifying (i.e. update) parameter to the smart card (see col. 12, lines 1-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Yacoob within the system of Alanara et al. because it would provide an independent system which fully contains all information that may impact the maintenance and operation of the machine.

In regard to claim 9, Yacoob discloses wherein the parameter is based the financial transactions (see col. 11, lines 22-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Yacoob within the system of Alanara et al. because it would provide an independent system which fully contains all information that may impact the maintenance and operation of the machine.

In regard to claim 21-22, Yacoob disclose wherein the status data is the status bit (see col. 15, lines 21-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Yacoob within the system of Alanara et al. because it would provide an independent system which fully contains all information that may impact the maintenance and operation of the machine.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 12-20 are allowable over the prior of records.
6. The reason for allowance of claims 12-20 can be found in previous Office Action.

Art Unit: 2111

7. Claims 5-7, 10-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The following is an Examiner's statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claims 5, 7, 10, 11 are allowable over the prior art of record because the Examiner found neither prior art cited in its entirety, nor based on the prior art, found any motivation to combine any of the said prior arts which teach the step of determining if the smart card was previously disabled before the step of checking identification code against a list stored locally at the card accept location (claim 5); only after the step of performing is completed, transmitting a request to the second device to purge the identification code of the smart card that the action was performed on from the list (claim 7); wherein the list comprises smart cards deemed ineligible to participate in the smart card system; smart card was previously denied access to participate in the smart card system but are currently deemed eligible to participate in the smart card system (claim 10); determining whether the status bit and the blocking status are consistent, wherein the status bit and the blocking status are consistent in one of the following event: when the status bit is enabled the blocking status is unblocked and when the status bit is disabled and the blocking status is blocked (claim 11).

Art Unit: 2111

Conclusion

8. Claims 1-4, 8-9, 21-22 are rejected. Claims 5-7, 10-11 are objected. Claims 12-20 are allowed.

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Raymond Phan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3630. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30AM- 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Primary, Paul Myers can be reached on (571) 272-3639 or via e-mail addressed to paul.myers@uspto.gov. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [raymond.phan@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 central telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

RP



PAUL R. MYERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Raymond Phan
Sept 11, 2005